

Bottcher, Helen

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 10:44 AM
To: wyckoffcomments
Subject: RE: Comments on Wykoff-Eagle Harbor remediation

Dear members of the EPA,

Thank you for extending the comment period to June 30th, 2016.

Not being an expert on the superfund site at Eagle Harbor-Wykoff site, the information is presented well but is extremely dense.

I have attempted to understand the alternatives to remediation for the site. Comparing Alternative 4 to Alternative 7 it seems the differences appear to be based on more expensive (#4) to less expensive (#7) for passive ground water discharge/treatment; as mentioned in Section 9.3.6 it was stated that Alternative 4 is "slightly more difficult to implement"; and that Alternative 7 does not have listed debris removal for the Upland section as seen in chart listed in Section 8 of the EPA document.

My preference would be to choose Alternative 4 over 7 based on the need to have enough funds available for protecting passive water discharge/treatment and to have funding available for debris removal. In addition, according to J. N. Knox and D. T. Fehsenfeld, choosing Alternative 4 achieves protection in a shorter time frame with less impacts on the local community, as well as the beach cleanup can be consolidated and treated as part of the Upland project and capped. Knox and Fehsenfeld also suggest that combining designs from the Seattle Seawall Project will maximize the habitat value of the concrete bulkhead as well as would include bicycle lanes during road upgrades to add safety for the public.

Thank you for considering my thoughts and opinions.

(b) (6)

Bainbridge Island, WA